# 1 AR General

**Resolved: In the United States, National Service ought to be Compulsory**

## Definitions

#### United States means the federal government

**Ballentine** Ballentine's Legal Dictionary and Thesaurus, "United States," 1995, p. 689

**United States 1. The federal government. 2. A sovereign nation or sovereign state called the "United States." 3. Territory over which this sovereign nation called the "United States" exercises sovereign power.**

#### National Service

**Sherraden 85’** Sherraden, Michael W.; Eberly, Donald J. "Individual Rights and Social Responsibilities: Fundamental Issues in National Service." Public Law Forum 4.1 (1985): 241-258.

**an organized program in which individuals give a period of service to the nation** or community. Generally, national service is thought of as a program for teenagers or young adults, but it is possible to consider national service for other age groups as well. Service **projects might be in any of a wide variety of areas, such as disaster relief, social services, housing rehabilitation, energy and natural resource conservation, education, public works, or international service**.

### Citizenship/Community

#### Through communal service citizenship is strengthened

**Dionne et al** **16’** Dionne, E.J., and Kayla Meltzer Drogosz. “United We Serve?: The Debate over National Service.” Brookings, Brookings, 28 July 2016, www.brookings.edu/articles/united-we-serve-the-debate-over-national-service/.

And **service could become a path**way **to a stronger sense of citizenship**. As Jane Eisner argues, **service “must** produce more than individual fulfillment for those involved and temporary assistance for those in need.” It should, she says, “**lead to an appetite for** substantive **change**, a commitment **to address** the **social problems that** have **created the need for service in the first place.”** Eisner suggests that as a nation, we should celebrate the First Vote cast by young people with the same fanfare that greets other moments of passage to adult responsibility. **The goal** would be **to encourage a new generation** that is **gravitating toward national service to make the connection “between service to the community and the very process that governs community life.”**

National service helps provide Americans  skills, which empowers them to improve their communities even after service.  
**Yoo 14’** (Tae - The steward of Cisco’s corporate social responsibility (CSR) vision, Tae Yoo leads the company’s social investment programs in education, healthcare, critical human needs, and economic development. Yoo drives a strategy that engages public-private partnerships and leverages Cisco’s business, technical, and financial assets for sustainable social impact in communities around the world. As a 20-year veteran of Cisco, Yoo’s insight and business acumen have enabled Cisco to collaborate across government, business, and non-governmental organization (NGO) sectors for tangible social benefit. Her leadership has helped make Cisco Networking Academy one of the largest education programs in the world, recognized globally for its innovative approach to providing ICT skills education. Today, Networking Academy engages more than 1 million concurrent students in over 165 countries.), "How National Service Can Help Communities And Build A Stronger Workforce", HuffPost, 10/09/14, [www.huffingtonpost.com/tae-yoo/positive-effects-national-service\_b\_5954878.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/tae-yoo/positive-effects-national-service_b_5954878.html)  
**Young Americans today are facing the crisis of unraveling traditional communities and social structures.** In fact**, 1 million students drop out of school each year, and 17 percent of youth**aged 16 to 24 **are out of school and work. This isn’t just a problem about unemployment or a weak future workforce — it escalates to encompass poverty, illiteracy, food insecurity, homelessness and a lack of health care, leading to a weakened civilization. How do we address this? There is already a good model in place, and it’s called national service. Groups like AmeriCorps, the Peace Corps, and other service organizations have a huge impact in the U**nited **S**tates **and around the world. They support communities, help people improve their lives and provide additional “human capital” to organizations that serve disadvantaged people**. But **they** also **help build a strong future workforce that is socially conscious, motivated, innovative, tenacious and talented. While serving their communities, corps members develop and deploy skills in communication, problem-solving, teamwork and leadership — skills that employers increasingly say are vital in the workplace.**

Compulsory national service may be an instance where restricting some liberty is necessary to maintain systems of liberty.  
**Hart** **73’** (H. L. A. - British legal philosopher, and a major figure in political and legal philosophy) "Rawls on Liberty and Its Priority", The University of Chicago Law Review, Vol. 40, No. 3 (Spring, 1973), p. 544, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1599247>  
I turn now to consider the principle **that basic liberties may be limited only for the sake of liberty**. Rawls expresses this principle in several different ways. He says that**basic liberties may be restricted or unequally distributed only for the sake of a greater "system of liberty as a whole"**;34 that the restriction must yield "a greater equal liberty,"35 or "the best total system of equal liberty"36 or "strengthen" that sys- tem,37 or be "a gain for ... freedom on balance."38 What, then, is it to limit liberty for the sake of liberty? Rawls gives a number of examples which his principle would permit**. The simplest case is the introduction of rules of order in debate, which restrict the liberty to speak when we please. Without this restriction the liberty to say and advocate what we please would be grossly hampered**and made less valuable to us. As Rawls says, such rules are necessary for "profitable"40 discussion, and plainly when such rules are introduced a balance is struck and the liberty judged less important or less valuable is subordinated to the other. In this very simple case there seems to be a quite obvious answer to the question as to which of the two liberties here conflicting is more valuable since, whatever ends we are pursuing in debate, the liberty to communicate our thought in speech must contribute more to their advancement than the liberty to interrupt communication. It seems to me, however, misleading to describe even the resolution of the conflicting liberties in this very simple case as yielding a "greater" or "stronger" total system of liberty, for these phrases suggest that no values other than liberty and dimensions of it, like ex- tent, size, or strength, are involved. Plainly **what such rules of debate help to secure is**not a greater or more extensive liberty, but **a liberty to do something which is more valuable for any** rational **person than the activities forbidden by the rules,** or, as Rawls himself says, some- thing more "profitable." So some criterion of the value of different liberties must be involved in the resolution of conflicts between them; yet Rawls speaks as if the system "of basic liberties" were self-contained, and conflicts within it were adjusted without appeal to any other value besides liberty and its extent. In some cases, it is true, Rawls's conception of a greater or more extensive liberty resulting from a more satisfactoryresolution of conflicts between liberties may have application. One fairly clear example is provided by Rawls when he says that **the principle of limiting liberty only for the sake of liberty would allow conscription for military service in a war genuinely undertaken to defend free institutions** either **at home or abroad.** In that case it might plausibly be said that**only the quantum or extent of liberty was at stake; the temporary restriction of liberty involved in military conscription might be allowed to prevent or remove much greater inroads on liberty**. Similarly, the restriction imposed in the name of public order and security, to which Rawls often refers,42 may be justified simply as hindering greater or more extensive hindrances to liberty of action. But there certainly are important cases of conflict between basic liberties where, as in the simple rules of debate case, the resolution of conflict must involve consideration of the relative value of different modes of conduct, and not merely the extent or amount of freedom. One such conflict, which, according to Rawls's four-stage sequence, will have to be settled at a stage analogous to a constitutional convention, is the conflict between freedom of speech and of the person, and freedom to participate in government through a democratically elected legislature.43 Rawls discusses this conflict on the footing that the freedom to participate in government is to be considered as restricted if there is a Bill of Rights protecting the individual's freedom of speech or of the person from regulation by an ordinary majority vote of the legislature. He says that the kind of argument to support such a restriction, which his principles of justice require, is "a justification which appeals only to a greater equal liberty."44 He admits that different opinions about the value of the conflicting liberties will affect the way in which different persons view this conflict. Nonetheless, he insists that to arrive at a just resolution of the conflict we must try to find the point at which "the danger to liberty from the marginal loss in control over those holding political power just balances the security of liberty gained by the greater use of constitutional devices."45 I cannot myself understand, however, how such weighing or striking of a balance is conceivable if the only appeal is, as Rawls says, to "a greater liberty."

**There’s a growing military-civilian gap in the US and this erodes our sense of obligation to the American project of democracy.**  
**Crizer 03’** (Scott - US Army Lt. Col, former Chairman of the Joint Service Small arms Synchronization Team, and Director Army Programs at FLIR Systems), “Universal National Service”, Strategy Research Project, 4/7/03, <http://www.dtic.mil/get-tr-doc/pdf?AD=ADA413492>  
**A telling demographic of today’s society is that only 6% of Americans under 65 have served** in the military.14 **This void of service will only make the challenges of this century more difficult as several generations of Americans may not have a sense of obligation to their nation. Without this sense of obligation a functioning democracy may be in peril**. If citizens do not understand the importance of duty and the price of American democracy, then **a complacency may set in.** This is not a new phenomenon as Theodore Roosevelt talked of this peril back in 1916 fearing that the different classes would grow estranged from each other as the country prospered. 15 **Since fewer and fewer Americans are serving in the military then the number of Americans who know someone in the military is also on a steady decline. Many Americans do not have the appreciation of the sacrifices and contributions that their fellow citizens are making by serving in the military**. As less Americans know someone in the military a smaller number of families are promoting military service to their children.

**Volunteerism in the US low and upwards of 50 million people stand to immediately benefit from compulsory national service.**  
**Schmitz 09’** (Captain Laura), "NATIONAL SERVICE: Every Citizen Plays a Part", EWS Contemporary Issues Paper Major B. Lewis, CG 4 20 February 2009, [www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a509939.pdf](http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a509939.pdf)  
According to a 2005 poll, **28.8% of Americans stated that they had volunteered through some organization at least once** (to include a one-day project). Nevertheless, **with the country reporting a population of** about **300 million people, these numbers are disappointingly low. The** 2007 **census**estimate**showed that 16.6 % of U.S. citizens are between the ages of 18 and 29. That means 49,800,000 young Americans are beginning their careers or entering college at this time. Each year, another 2 million enter this age bracket.6 These are the years when social ideals are formed in future leaders. What better time would there be to serve 18-24 months of service to the country than during these years?**

### Education

#### Critical thinking is k2 restructuring institutions

**Abowitz et al** **06’** Abowitz, Kathleen Knight, and Jason Harnish. “Contemporary Discourses of Citizenship.” JSTOR, American Educational Research Association, 2006, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4124417.

**To reclaim democratic institutions** for the poor and marginalized, **reconstructionist citizenship discourse embraces critical thinking, conflict, and controversy.** Westheimer and Kahne (2003) explicitly address the distinction between the kind of critical thinking advocated in the political liberal discourse and the kind touted by reconstructionists. "The consensus regarding critical thinking generally vanishes when the possibility arises that students will articulate conclusions that differ from mainstream or parental values (or, in some cases, values the teacher holds that differ from mainstream values)" (p. 10). **Educators in public schools often see "critical thinking" and citizenship in a way that will work in the interests of the current hierarchy and structure.** Indeed, as Kincheloe (2001) explains, in the reconstructionist discourse of citizenship, the term critical has an explicitly political frame. "**Critical theory is concerned** ... **with issues of power and justice and the ways** that the economy, matters of race, class, and gender, ideologies, discourses, education, religion and other **social institutions, and cultural dynamics interact to** construct the social systems that **construct our consciousness"**

### Equality

Compulsory national service can improve social cohesion in an increasingly diverse and divided United States.  
**Litan 03’** (Robert E. - Robert Litan was a nonresident senior fellow in the Economic Studies Program at Brookings, where he formerly had been vice president and director of Economic Studies as well as a senior fellow. As an economist and attorney, Litan has had nearly four decades of experience in the worlds of the law, economic research and policy, and as an executive in both the private, public and government sectors.) “The Obligation of September 11, 2001: The Case for Universal Service” In United We Serve: National Service and the Future of Citizenship. Brookings Institute Press. 2003.  
First, **universal service could provide** some much-needed **“social glue” in an embattled American society** that is growing increasingly diverse—by race, national origin, and religious preference—and where many young Americans from well-to-do families grow up and go to school in hermetically sealed social environments. Twenty years ago, when America was much less diverse than it is now and is going to be, the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal (of all places) opined that **mandatory service would constitute a “means for** acculturation, **acquainting young people with their fellow Americans of all different races, creeds, and economic backgrounds.”**2 Those words are as compelling today as when they were written. A service program in which young people from different backgrounds work and live together would do far more than college ever could to immerse young Americans in the diversity of our country. **It would also help sensitize more fortunate young men and women**, at an impressionable point in their lives, **to the concerns and experiences of others from different back- grounds** and give them an enduring appreciation of what life is like “on the other side of the tracks.”

### Government

#### National Service better’s democracy

**Dionne et al** **16’** Dionne, E.J., and Kayla Meltzer Drogosz. “United We Serve?: The Debate over National Service.” Brookings, Brookings, 28 July 2016, www.brookings.edu/articles/united-we-serve-the-debate-over-national-service/.

**Citizenship** cannot be reduced to service. And service-good works whether of faith communities, the private sector, or “communities of character”—**cannot replace the responsibilities of government.** **Service can become a form of cheap grace, a generalized call on citizens to do kind things** as an alternative to a genuine summons for national sacrifice or a fair apportionment of burdens among the more and less powerful, the more and less wealthy. **But when service is seen as a bridge to genuine political and civic responsibility, it can strengthen democratic government** and foster the republican virtues.

#### AmeriCorps increases government participation

**Gianelli** **15’** Gianelli, Patrick Louis. “CIVIC ENGAGEMENT AND THE AMERICORPS MEMBER EXPERIENCE.” JSTOR, California State University, Sacramento, 2015, www.csus.edu/ppa/thesis-project/bank/2015/gianelli.pdf.

In their seminal book on civic voluntarism in America Voice and Equality, Verba, Schlozman, and Brady defined civic skills as “competency in English, vocabulary, writing letters, going to meetings, taking part in decision making, planning or chairing a meeting, and giving a presentation or speech” (as cited in Kirlin, 2003). Patrick (2000) categorized civic skills as cognitive and participatory, with cognitive skills involving critical thinking and analytical skills, while participatory skills are concerned with actions. **The** 2008 **CNCS study** measured members’ perceptions of their civic skills by asking about how confident they were in their ability to work with local government and organize community activities. The study **found that those who served in AmeriCorps saw a 25% increase in their** perceived **ability to work with local government and to lead a successfully community-based movement**, with significance at the .01 level, compared to those who did not serve (CNCS, 2008).

### Military

#### Turn- **an all-volunteer military makes the government less likely to go to war due to an increase in visible costs of war.** Henderson & Seagren 12’ (David R - Associate Professor Graduate School of Business and Public Policy Naval Postgraduate School & Chad W - Assistant Professor Operations Research Department Naval Postgraduate School) “Would Conscription Reduce Support For War?”, 6/22/12 Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2093559> Wagner (1972) examines, through the lens of democratic politics, the effect of enlistment method on military budgets and the collective decision to go to war. He concludes that having an all-volunteer military makes the government less likely to go to war than if some of the military were drafted. His reasoning is that having an all-volunteer force makes the cost of the force and of war more visible. A draft, by contrast, hides part of the cost of war by taking some of it out of the explicit defense budget and putting it on the backs of young men. The median voter is not likely to be a young draftee. Instead, the median voter will be a taxpayer.3 Because the military must persuade, rather than coerce, people to join an all-volunteer military, it will likely pay higher wages in the event of a war. This raises the cost to the median voter, making a given war less likely to occur.

#### Turn- Getting rid of the draft turned American increased militarism

**Sirota 13’** Sirota, David. “How Dropping the Draft Helped to Turn America Into a Militaristic State. “AlterNet, 9 May 2013, www.alternet.org/how-dropping-draft-helped-turn-america-militaristic-state.

Few probably recall the name Dwight Elliott Stone. But even if his name has faded from the national memory, the man remains historically significant. That's because on June 30, 1973, the 24-year-old plumber's apprentice became the last American forced into the armed services before the military draft expired. Though next month's 40-year anniversary of the end of conscription will likely be as forgotten as Stone, it shouldn't be. In operations across the globe, the all-volunteer military has been employed by policymakers to birth what Gen. George Casey recently called the "era of persistent conflict." Four decades later, we therefore have an obligation to ask: How much of the public's complicity in that epochal shift is a result of the end of the draft? There is, of course, no definitive answer to such a complex question. However, a look back at some lost history shows that today's public acquiescence to militarism was exactly what the government wanted when it ended the draft. That loaded term - "militarism" - was, in fact, a prominent part of the 1970 report by President Nixon's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force. In its findings, the panel worried about "a cycle of anti-militarism" in a nation then questioning America's increasingly martial posture. Noting that "the draft is a major source of antagonism" toward the growing military-industrial complex, the report praised the fact that "an all-volunteer force offers an obvious opportunity to curb the growth of anti-militaristic sentiment." Nixon's commission did devote some empty rhetoric to downplaying "the fear of increased military aggressiveness or reduced civilian concern" about military actions in the event of an all-volunteer force. But the report's political conclusions were clear: By disconnecting most Americans from the blood-and-guts consequences of war, the end of the draft would "decrease dissent stemming from conscription" and "close one of the channels" of anti-war organizing. Today, such conclusions read like prophecy. Though polls showed that many Americans opposed the Iraq War, that invasion and occupation was historically unprecedented in length and yet never generated the kind of mass protest that earlier shorter wars evoked. Same thing for the Afghanistan War. Same thing for all the forward deployments to far-flung bases and one-off missions. The pattern suggests that in the absence of conscription, dissent - if it exists at all - becomes a low-grade affair (an email, a petition, etc.) but not the kind of serious movement required to compel military policy changes. Why? Because as former Defense Secretary Robert Gates put it, without a draft "wars remain an abstraction - a distant and unpleasant series of news items that does not affect (most people) personally.” The danger, says West Point's Lance Betros, is that Americans then "reflexively move towards a military solution before they will try all the other elements of national power."  That reality has prompted some lawmakers in recent years to propose reinstating the draft. They argue it is the only way to compel Americans to truly care about the foreign policy and national security decisions of their government. Well-meaning people can certainly disagree about whether a modern-day draft is a good idea or not (and it may not be). But forty years into the all-volunteer experiment, it is clear that ending conscription was as much about giving citizens the liberty to abstain from as about quashing popular opposition to martial decisions. By design, it weakened our democratic connection to the armed forces - a connection that is the only proven safeguard against unbridled militarism.

### Economy

#### Turn: National Service is good for the economy- boosts employment and strengthens econ

**Boteach et al** **09’** Boteach, Melissa, et al. National Service and Youth Unemployment. Center for American Progress, 16 Nov. 2009, [www.americanprogress.org/issues/poverty/reports/2009/11/16/6910/national-service-and-youth-unemployment/](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/poverty/reports/2009/11/16/6910/national-service-and-youth-unemployment/).

**Investments in National Service programs** such as AmeriCorps, VISTA, YouthBuild, and other youth corps programs **deserve** serious **consideration as part of a** national **strategy to tackle unemployment**, provide anti-**poverty** services, **and strengthen our economy.** These **programs** can **prepare young adults for long-term employment opportunities in the public and private sector.** National service programs create full-time positions that are—in most cases—jointly paid for by public and private resources. These entry-level public service positions pay a poverty-level living allowance or slightly more, and they come with health-care benefits, sometimes child-care benefits, and the opportunity for [Segal AmeriCorps Education Awards](http://www.americorps.gov/for_individuals/benefits/benefits_ed_award.asp), which help recipients pay for higher education, educational training, or student loans. National service programs are not designed as long-term career positions, but these **national service jobs have historically helped boost job creation** by providing opportunities for difficult-to-employ youth and recent college graduates, while also building nonprofit organizations’ capacity to continue this important social service.

### Nationalism

Compulsory national service would help us improve the United States and would cement the link between our rights and our responsibilities to others.  
**Litan 03’** (Robert E. - Robert Litan was a nonresident senior fellow in the Economic Studies Program at Brookings, where he formerly had been vice president and director of Economic Studies as well as a senior fellow. As an economist and attorney, Litan has had nearly four decades of experience in the worlds of the law, economic research and policy, and as an executive in both the private, public and government sectors.) “The Obligation of September 11, 2001: The Case for Universal Service” In United We Serve: National Service and the Future of Citizenship. Brookings Institute Press. 2003.  
Third, **young people serving in a civilian capacity in particular would help satisfy unmet social needs beyond those associated with homeland security**: **improving the reading skills of tens of millions of Americans who cannot now read English at a high school level, cleaning up blighted neighborhoods, and helping provide social, medical, and other services to the elderly and to low-income individuals and families**. Allowing individuals to delay their service until after college would enable them to bring skills to their service that could prove even more useful to society and thus may be a desirable option. But doing so would also reduce the benefits of added social cohesion from universal service because it would tend to cre- ate two tiers of service, one for those who don’t go to college and another for those who do. Finally, **universal service would establish firmly the notion that rights for ourselves come with responsibilities to others**. Of course, the **Constitution guarantees all citizens certain rights**—free speech, due process of law, free- dom from discrimination, voting—**without asking anything of them in return. But why shouldn’t citizens be required to give something to their country in exchange for the full range of rights to which citizenship entitles them**?

Military conscription began as a tool of nationalism that functioned to create ideological unity with the nation as the focal point.    
**Conversi 15’** (Daniele - , IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, Bilbao, Spain; and Department of Contemporary History University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Leioa, Spain), "War and Nationalism", International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences, Second Edition, 2015, 363–370, <https://www.libraryofsocialscience.com/assets/pdf/War_and_Nationalism-FINAL.pdf>  
From July 1791, even before the war began, to July 1794, the French army became the target of a strenuous propaganda effort, with 7 million copies of various revolutionary journals distributed among high- and low-rank soldiers, although most of them could hardly read or write (Lynn, 1996). Mobilized around the sacred defense of La Patrie (the Mother/Fatherland), soldiers were hailed as the supreme expression of ‘collective will,’ while war was described as the finest of national virtues. **Before the levée, volunteers were drafted in through an array of visual effects and media grandeur, often surrounded by a festival atmosphere**punctuated by martial music. **For urban elites, mass conscription became de facto a ‘nation-building’ device insofar as nationalism could emerge as the broader interclass ideology suitable to mobilize and control a largely rural population. “The first mass army depended ultimately upon a political revolution whose ideology, redolent of nationalism, stressed the equality and community of all Frenchmen**” (Posen, 1993: 83). **The emphasis on patriotic unity concealed and embellished deep ideological cleavages. This is how nationalism sprouted** like a deus ex machina, **providing the decisive strategic advantage and the common denominator of all ideological forces competing to act in the name of the Republic**. **Through war mobilization, Parisian**riotous**elites achieved unified support for what had become one of the most fragmented, ideologically splintered, and identity-fractured countries in Europe**. For instance, insofar as he did not control the National Convention and the Committee of Public Safety, Maximilien Robespierre (1758–94) was opposed to war, which he intuitively felt as a potential distractive device through which ‘antirevolutionary’ forces could seize power (Robespierre, 2007: 30; Scurr, 2006). However, once in full control, he did not hesitate to pursue war further to consolidate his own supremacy. **By merging culture, ideology, terror, and war at once, nationalism offered an impromptu combination of consensus and coercion, ‘spontaneous’ peer pressure and hetero-directed state repression.** Although the Reign of Terror’s bloodbath reached its peak after November 1793, when the threat of foreign invasion had receded, war abroad coincided with a dramatic increase in repression at home: systematic mass killing by government troops led some historians to identify the Vendée massacres (1793–96) as the first modern genocide (Jones, 2010: 6–7; Levene, 2008; Secher, 2003). The ‘eliminationist’ pattern was replicated, expanded, and ‘refined’ in other provinces and cities, like Brittany and Lyon. **Together with the remoteness of the ‘punished’ regions, war provided the most suitable cover to carry out ominous crimes and abuses**, which were hardly conceivable in pace times and in more dense urban setting.

### Constitutional

#### Courts have recognized that National Service is Const. and doesn’t violate the 13th Amendment

**Pauwels** **13’** Andrew Pauwels, Candidate for Juris Doctor, Notre Dame Law School, 2014; Bachelor of Arts, University of Notre Dame, 2009. "MANDATORY NATIONAL SERVICE: CREATING GENERATIONS OF CIVIC MINDED CITIZENS." Notre Dame Law Review. vol. 88:5. <http://ndlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/NDL517_Pauwels.pdf>

First, **the Third Circuit** in Steirer **upheld** the service requirement, but refused to follow the lower court’s reasoning **that service requirements can be justified** solely **on the grounds that the program provides** for “the **public**, and **not private**, **interest and benefit.”** Essential to the court’s analysis was not the benefit received by the public, but the “stark differences” between what the students were required to do and what the Thirteenth Amendment was ratified to eliminate. From the outset, the Supreme Court has held that involuntary servitude incorporates “those forms of compulsory labor akin to African slavery which in practical operation would tend to produce like undesirable results.”206 While the “general spirit”207 of the phrase fails to definitively answer the question, it provides the context in which advocates of compulsory service should present the program, whether before the courts, Congress, or the American people. **Such a program would bear little resemblance to** the institution of **African slavery.** **Presumably, any such program would include job training, provide minimal health, salary, and living benefits, and be aimed towards broad public ends. Additionally, it should be noted that such service is much more akin to—though much broader in scope than—the constitutionally valid “traditional” civic duty exceptions than it is to slavery**

# DA Blocks

## College

#### College enrollment is decreasing- steady market proves

**Wong 16’** Wong, Alia. “Where Are All the High-School Grads Going?” The Atlantic, The Atlantic, 11 Jan. 2016, [www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/01/where-are-all-the-high-school-grads-going/423285/](http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/01/where-are-all-the-high-school-grads-going/423285/).

The **latest** national **data shows** that **more students are getting their high-school diplomas** than ever before. Just over 82 percent of the students who were high-school seniors during the 2013-14 year graduated, up from 81 percent the year before. The rate has inched up annually over the last few years, largely because of strides made by disadvantaged students—an accomplishment President Obama [is likely to highlight](http://www.politico.com/story/2016/01/barack-obama-state-of-the-union-address-video-217422) in his State of the Union address Tuesday. **But that doesn’t mean more** kids **are going to college.** Quite the opposite. Recently released numbers out of the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center suggests that **college-enrollment rates have** actually **decreased**—and **for the fourth straight year**, all despite [massive increases](http://higheredtoday.org/2015/11/25/where-have-all-the-low-income-students-gone/) in federal aid for students who can’t afford tuition. The number of students enrolling in colleges and universities this year is 1.7 percent lower than it was last year. (The percentage of high-school graduates who immediately enrolled in college fell from 69 percent in 2008 to 66 percent in 2013.) This isn’t new information, but it is new data for a new year, so it’s worth asking again: Where are all those high-school graduates going if they’re not ending up in higher education? For economists and education experts, **the answer is obvious.** As the Stanford economist Caroline Hoxby and the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign economist Jeffrey Brown [have famously argued](http://www.nber.org/chapters/c12862), students were more likely to enroll and stay in college during the Great Recession; at a time when there are fewer jobs, would-be college students are more likely to invest in opportunities to develop skills and enhance their chances at getting employed. **People are drawn back to**ward **the workforce once the economy** has **started to recover**, which is what experts suspect is happening now. So this college-enrollment trend could be considered, as The Atlantic’s Derek Thompson [wrote](https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/09/college-enrollment-plummeted-in-2012-but-for-very-good-reasons/279389/) back in 2013, “actually a sign of good news.”

#### No Link- It’s impossible for a couple hundred thousand of people to trigger the DA

## Sexual Assault

## 